



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

#### IV.—MIMNERMUS AND PROPERTIUS.

A few years ago Wilamowitz<sup>1</sup> set forth the theory that Mimnermus was an important model for the Cynthia book of Propertius.<sup>2</sup> This idea, supported as it was by the weight of Wilamowitz's great name, has been received with much favor by students of Roman Elegy. Of half a dozen reviewers of his book, one<sup>3</sup> speaks favorably of his conclusions in this article, and none of the others offers any opposition. In spite of the almost universal acceptance of his views, the grounds upon which he rests his case are, in my judgment, utterly insufficient;

<sup>1</sup> "Mimnermos und Properz", published in the Sitzungsberichte d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., 1912, I, pp. 100-122: republished with (rather important but unmarked) changes in his "Sappho und Simonides", Berlin, 1913, pp. 276-304. In this paper references are by pages of the later edition.

<sup>2</sup> His words are (pp. 303 f.): "Unter deren Vorbilder rechne ich nun den Mimnermos und schlage seine Bedeutung für Properz hoch an, obgleich ich keine direkte Berührung zu zeigen weisz. Die Cynthia hat dadurch sofort einen entschiedenen Erfolg gehabt, dasz sie das Leben schilderte, das Properz trieb, mit seinen Freunden und seinem Mädchen. Ein solches Lebensbild bot auch die Nanno des Mimnermos. Die Bücher waren so verschieden wie das Kolophon des Alyattes von dem Rom des Augustus; aber Properz empfand, dasz er als Dichter zum Leben stand wie Mimnermos und benannte sein Buch Cynthia nach dem Vorbilde der Nanno. Und die Gedichtbücher hatten auch mehr verwandtes als den Titel, atmeten sie doch beide denselben *φιλήδονος βλος* :

*τίς δὲ βλος, τί δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χροσῆς Ἀφροδίτης;*  
*laus in amore mori*".

<sup>3</sup> J. Mesk, in Berl. phil. Woch. 34 (1914), col. 167. The other reviews are: Athenaeum 1913, I, pp. 212 f.; J. Sitzler, in Woch. f. klass. Phil. 32 (1915), coll. 73 ff.; Bayr. Bl. 50 (1914), pp. 452 f.; Litt. Zentralb. 65 (1914), coll. 101 ff.; Class. Phil. 8 (1913), pp. 361 ff. (Shorey). Professor Harrington also concurs (Elegiac Poets, Introd. p. 17) But Professor Wheeler in A. J. P. 36 (1915), p. 159, n. 1, says: "Wilamowitz exaggerates, it seems to me, the influence of Mimnermus". I take this opportunity to acknowledge my debt to Professor Duane Reed Stuart, of Princeton, to whose suggestion this article is due, and who agrees in the main with its conclusions. [Compare also Prof. Gildersleeve's review of Wilamowitz, A. J. P. 33 (1912), 361 ff., which was published before any of the reviews cited above.—C. W. E. M.]

and it is the purpose of this paper to show wherein he fails to substantiate his claims.

The proper point of departure for such an argument must always be the writings of the two authors concerned. The fragments of Mimnermus that have come down to us are unfortunately very meager; but they are all we have to go on except the testimony of later classical writers. Wilamowitz by no means confines himself to the fragments; in fact, he makes little use of them in proving his point, and depends much upon the impression made upon him by remarks of Hermesianax and the Augustan writers. These, it seems to me, he stretches into meaning more than they say. Let us examine in detail these two lines of evidence.

The fragments of Mimnermus treat of love, especially stolen love (fr. 1)<sup>1</sup>; old age, the bane of man's existence (1-5, perhaps 6); the unfaithful wife and the jealous revenge of her deceived husband (22). Fr. 11 tells of the travels of Jason, which might have been the myth illustrating the journey of a faithless mistress or of the lover himself when called away. Further mythological allusions appear in fr. 18, of a certain Daetes of Troy; in 19, of Niobe; in 21, of the story of Ismene and Theoclymenus; and in 22, of Diomedes and his wife. The ceaseless toiling of the sun, fr. 12, might perhaps have been connected with the toil needed to win and hold a lady's affections. If fr. 8 is a portion of a conversation between the lover and his lass, it may parallel the protestations of eternal fidelity in the Roman poet, and the prayer that they may love while they are young and still be models of affection when they are old and gray.<sup>2</sup>

This is all the evidence furnished by the extant fragments. The testimonia add something. Of these the most important is Hermesianax fr. 3 Hartung.<sup>3</sup> In these lines he is said to have

<sup>1</sup>The numbers of the fragments are those in the fourth edition of Bergk's "Poetae Lyrici Graeci", vol. 2, Berlin, 1882. I have tried to read into these fragments every possible elegiac motif, in order not to overlook any possible points of contact with Propertius. Some will probably seem far-fetched.

<sup>2</sup>Prop. 1. 19. 25 f.; Tibull. 1. 1. 69, 1. 6. 85 f.

<sup>3</sup>Lines 35-40:

*Μίμνερμος δέ, τὸν ἡδὺν δὲ εὗρετο πολλὸν ἀνατλάς  
ἤχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεῦμ' ἀπὸ πενταμέτρου,*

"burned for Nanno", held revels with Examyas, and hated Hermobius and Pherecles. If the emended reading *μοιχῶ κνήμην θείς* in 37 f. is correct, it would show that he wrote of his triumphs over his rival. Unfortunately it is exceedingly doubtful, and Wilamowitz himself does not adopt this reading. In Alexander of Aetolia fr. 3 Hartung,<sup>1</sup> which concerns Mimnermus, is a reference to boy-love; it appears also from this poem that Mimnermus wrote of shoemakers and shameless thieves and robbers,<sup>2</sup> and suffered many misfortunes. This means, of course, that he pictured low life—the life of his own class, as Wilamowitz points out.<sup>3</sup> The other important testimonia are Propertius I. 9. 11,<sup>4</sup> which really says no more than that in affairs of the heart love poetry helps more than epic, and Horace Epist. 2. 2. 99 ff.<sup>5</sup> Here Horace does not mention Propertius, but the reference seems unmistakable. Just how much it means is an open question. Wilamowitz lays a good deal of emphasis upon it, though he thinks it is ironical; that Horace realized fully the gulf separating Propertius from the classical Greek poets, but tickled his friend's vanity by the

---

*καίετο μὲν Ναννοῦς, πολὺ δ' ἐπὶ πολλάκι μοιχῶ  
κνήμην θείς κώμους εἶχε σὺν Ἐξαμύῃ.  
δῆχθη δ', Ἑρμόβιον τὸν αἰὲ βαρὺν ἠδὲ Φερεκλῆν  
ἐχθρὸν μισήσας, οἷ' ἀνέπεμψεν ἔπη.*

So Hartung. Wilamowitz reads, with one MS, *λωτῶ κημωθείς*. The other MSS have *μωτωκημωθείς*. See Hartung's critical note.

<sup>1</sup> οὗς Ἀγαθοκλῆος λάσαιι φρένες ἤλασαν ἔξω  
πατρίδος, ἀρχαίων ἦν δδ' ἀνὴρ προγόνων,  
εἰδὼς ἐκ νεότητος αἰὲ ξείνοισιν ὀμιλεῖν  
ξεῖνος, Μιμνέρμου δ' εἰς ἔπος ἄκρον ἰὼν  
5 παιδομανεῖ σὺν ἔρωτι κατήνυσεν· ἔγραφε δ' ὦνῆρ  
εὐ παρ' Ὀμηρεῖν ἀγλαίην ἐπέων  
πισύργους ἢ φῶρας ἀναιδέας ἢ τινα χλοῦνην  
φλύων ἀνθηρῇ σὺν κακοειμονίῃ,  
τοῖα Συρακοσίοις καὶ ἔχον χάριν· δς δὲ Βοιωτοῦ  
ἐκλυεν, Εὐβοίῃ τέρψεται οὐδ' ὀλίγον.

<sup>2</sup> Or perhaps there is a reference to wild boars; the meaning of *χλοῦνην* is uncertain. See the lexicon.

<sup>3</sup> L. c., p. 278.

<sup>4</sup> Plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero.

<sup>5</sup> Discedo Alcaeus puncto illius, ille meo quis?  
Quis nisi Callimachus? Si plus adposcere visus,  
fit Mimnermus, et optivo cognomine crescit.

remark. Wilamowitz says:<sup>1</sup> "Das *optimum cognomen* war eine treffende Bosheit, um so treffender, wenn Properz oder seine Bewunderer ihn als neuen Mimnermos gegen den neuen Alkaeos ausspielten". There is nothing in Propertius, however, to support this view, and this fact deprives the argument of weight. Since Propertius described himself<sup>2</sup> as the Roman Callimachus, it seems hardly probable that modesty or any other motive would have caused him to leave unexpressed his aspirations to be a Roman Mimnermus. His own attitude has more value than that of his friends, as to which in any case we can form no opinion. It is probable that the words merely show a joking attempt to balance the name Alcaeus with one of equal antiquity and honor in the other field, rather than with that of an Alexandrian.

It appears, then, that Mimnermus wrote of love, especially stolen love; the banefulness of old age; infidelity, deception of a husband, and his jealous vengeance; his own revelry and enmity, boy-love, low life, and the sorrows of this world. Perhaps he touched also upon travel, fidelity, and toiling to win love. It is possible, too, that his rival's defeat formed a topic. We shall now see to what extent Propertius and Tibullus dealt with these themes; the reason for including Tibullus will be evident as the argument progresses. I have limited myself to the first book of each author, as these two books were published almost simultaneously,<sup>3</sup> and there is little possibility of one's having influenced the other, as might have been the case with later books. Moreover, Wilamowitz is considering only the first book of Propertius.

It needs no search to find our first topic in the Roman Elegiac writers; love is of course the business of the Elegists.<sup>4</sup> Stolen love, however, is not a subject of Propertius; he is open in his

<sup>1</sup> L. c., p. 288.

<sup>2</sup> 4. 1. 64.

<sup>3</sup> Schanz, Röm. Lit. II, I<sup>3</sup>, pp. 253, 225 f., says Propertius published his first book not after 28 B. C., and Tibullus probably in 26. Professor Kirby Smith, Tibullus, p. 58, n. 1, says: "The first book of Propertius . . . was perhaps published soon after October of 28, the first book of Tibullus . . . about a year later".

<sup>4</sup> It is interesting that Jacoby, Rhein. Mus. 60 (1905), p. 44, says that Mimnermus did not treat of love as Roman Elegy did; not of passion for an individual, but of love itself.

passion for Cynthia.<sup>1</sup> Turning to Tibullus, we find several instances of it; e. g. 1. 2. 15 ff.; 1. 5. 7, 75; 1. 6. 5 f., 16 ff.; 1. 8. 35, 57; 1. 9. 23, 55; the first two and 1. 8. 57 deal with the poet's own intrigues, and the rest with those of others.

The worst bugbear of Mimnermus is old age. Propertius makes no allusion to this topic. The words *canities* and *senecta* occur once each, while *canus*, *senex*, and *senectus* do not appear. In Tibullus, however, the motif is common: cf. 1. 1. 71 f.; 1. 2. 89 ff.; 1. 4. 31 f.; 1. 6. 77 ff.; 1. 8. 41 f., 50; 1. 9. 74.

Infidelity, with the deception of husbands and their consequent jealousy and revenge, the probable topic of fr. 22 of Mimnermus, is touched on in Prop. 1. 8, and in 1. 11, but does not form an important subject. The word *coniunx*, even in its elegiac or "Pickwickian" sense, does not appear in the Cynthia book except in the fifteenth elegy, where it refers to the husbands of mythological heroines; and the ladies mentioned were above deception. Only Tibullus again has anything to say of the infidelity of wives and the deception of elegiac husbands: e. g. 1. 2. 19 ff., 41 ff.; 1. 6. 8, 15 ff.; 1. 9. 53 ff. (a long passage), 71 f. Even he does not introduce the husband's jealousy and vengeance; the poor husband is always blind. If the passage in Mimnermus was intended as a warning to Nanno of what happened to ladies who were untrue to their lovers, it would suggest a theme that occurs in both Propertius and Tibullus; e. g. Prop. 1. 12, Tibull. 1. 6, etc.

Revelry is the subject of the opening lines of Prop. 1. 3, but it is only mentioned in passing, as it were, as a prelude to the scene that follows. Another parallel is perhaps found in Tibull. 1. 5. 37 ff.

Personal hatred does not appear in Propertius, and Tibullus develops it at only one place (1. 9. 53 ff., against a successful rival).

The subject of boy-love is not found in the first book of Propertius. Tibullus treats the topic in the fourth, eighth and ninth elegies of book one.

In a sense, the life that is portrayed in the elegy is almost all low life; but we find in these two books no trace of the description of low life as it seems to have appeared in Mimnermus.

<sup>1</sup> A possible but doubtful case is 1. 16. 20.

We see in them rather the lowest side of the life of the rich and profligate young Roman.

The sorrows of this world are often the theme of the elegiac poets; cf. the first, eighth, twelfth, eighteenth and other elegies of the Cynthia, and the second, fourth (at the end), fifth, ninth and other elegies of Tibullus's first book.

We have now discussed those motifs which were surely represented in Mimnermus. Of those which he may have had, travel is common in Propertius; e. g. 1. 6; 1. 8; 1. 17; also 1. 1. 29 f.; 1. 12. 11; 1. 20. 18 ff. The last uses the same myth as that employed by Mimnermus (the Argonautic expedition). Tibullus 1. 3 seems to be the only instance in that writer.

Fidelity between lovers one might expect to be a favorite motif. This is borne out by the instances in both Propertius and Tibullus. Propertius has it in 1. 1. 35 f.; 1. 2. 24, 31 f.; 1. 4; 1. 8. 21; 1. 12. 20; 1. 15. 29 ff.; 1. 18. 11 f.; 1. 19. 11. In Tibullus we find it at 1. 3. 83; 1. 6. 67, 75 f., 85 f.

Enduring toil to win love is less common in both. Propertius uses the motif once only, 1. 1. 9 ff. Tibullus also has but one example, 1. 4. 47 ff.

Defeat of a rival is told of triumphantly in Prop. 1. 8b, and possibly in Tibull. 1. 6. 28.

To recapitulate: of ten motifs (omitting the general topic of love) that were certainly handled by Mimnermus, only three, infidelity, revelry, and the sorrows of life, appear in Propertius; and two of these only seldom and usually in a rather incidental manner; while Tibullus uses eight (all except low life and the husband's jealous revenge); of these, revelry and probably personal hatred are not quite certain. The four doubtful motifs (one, according to our evidence, improbable) are all used by both elegists; but two (toiling for love and defeat of a rival) appear only once in each (the latter doubtful for Tibullus), and the others are more common in Propertius, especially the travel motif, of which Tibullus has but one instance. So far, then, as the evidence of their works and the testimonia goes, the influence of Mimnermus upon Propertius was very slight. In fact, on this score a better case might be made out for Tibullus than for Propertius.

We turn now to the consideration of some of the arguments used by Wilamowitz to support his assertion. His chief reliance

is the title *Cynthia*, which is like the title *Nanno*, the only one found in connection with ancient citations from *Mimnermus*. He argues<sup>1</sup> that, since *Propertius* felt that as a poet he bore the same relation to life as *Mimnermus*, he called his book the *Cynthia* after the model of the *Nanno*. As to that, it is very evident that *Cynthia* filled the book, as she filled the life, of *Propertius*; it is not so clear that this was the case with *Nanno* and *Mimnermus*, even though we read in *Hermesianax* that he burned for her; that the two poets bore the same relation to life is rather an arbitrary assertion of an opinion than an established fact. Moreover, in his article<sup>2</sup> *Wilamowitz* gives the titles of many other works which the authors named for their wives or mistresses. It was quite common to assign such names to poems or books. Some of the *Idyls* of *Theocritus* and *Eclogues* of *Vergil* are cases in point. And among books named for a lady-love or a favorite we know of the *Cyrnus*, *Lyde*, *Bittis* and *Leontium*, as well as the *Nanno*. It is going too far to bar any of these because it is named for a wife. One would hesitate to couple a wife's name thus with that of another poet's mistress,<sup>3</sup> but the argument is hardly reversible. The number of books similarly named is too great to admit of any argument in support of the claim that in the choice of a name for his book *Propertius* was primarily influenced by the name of the work of *Mimnermus*.

One more feature of Roman Elegy that points, in the opinion of *Wilamowitz*,<sup>4</sup> to *classical* Greek elegy is the lingering and reflection upon one's own emotions. It is true that we do not find this element in what we have left of the works of *Callimachus* and *Philetas*,<sup>5</sup> but no more does it exist in the fragments of *Mimnermus*. Moreover, another and a nearer source is not far to seek. The *epyllion* is full of the analysis of the feelings.

<sup>1</sup> L. c., p. 304

<sup>2</sup> L. c., pp. 287 ff.

<sup>3</sup> This is the reason given by *Wilamowitz* (and earlier by *Pohlenz*, *Xáριτες*, 1911, p. 112, n. 2) for the belief that *Bittis* was the wife, not the mistress, of *Philetas*; cf. *Ovid*, *Trist.* 1. 6. 1 ff.

<sup>4</sup> L. c., p. 302.

<sup>5</sup> This spelling has been defended by *Bechtel* in *Genethliakon für Robert*, Berlin, 1910, p. 73, against *Crönert*, who supported the form *Philitas* in *Herm.* 37 (1902), pp. 213 ff.



Not the poet's own feelings, indeed; but given this practice, and the fondness for expressing one's own passions, so common in epigram, the combination of the two is an easy step. Furthermore, the monologue of the drama is an excellent example of the same tendency;<sup>1</sup> and Wilamowitz admits the drama as a source.<sup>2</sup>

While advancing the claims of Mimnermus as an important model for Propertius, Wilamowitz belittles the influence of a number of other writers who have usually been rated high. For instance, he says<sup>3</sup> that, while Propertius may have found material in the *Aitia* of Callimachus, yet this work contained nothing that bore on Callimachus's own love affairs, and that this evidence appeared only in his epigrams. As Propertius admittedly<sup>4</sup> made use of epigram as a source, Wilamowitz is not advancing any argument at all against the value of Callimachus to Propertius, and this fact which he points out should weigh very little in comparison with the repeated allusions to Callimachus in Propertius, of which more later. Philetas, another elegist whom Propertius professed to follow, is dismissed with these words:<sup>5</sup> "Den spindeldürren Stubengelehrten Philitas als Vorbild des Erotikers Properz kann ich dagegen kaum ernst nehmen. . . . Ich weisz nicht, wie Philitas war, und was er taugte, aber dem Theokrit ähnlich, von Mimnermos und Properz ganz verschieden denk ich ihn mir". Of Philetas more will be said later. With regard to Antimachus, the fragments of the *Lyde* offer little evidence that would induce us to regard him as an important source. Mythological elements appear in many (e. g. 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20),<sup>6</sup> but in none at great length. Fr. 12 introduces the love motif. Fr. 17, which is perhaps not genuine, deals with the question why Aphrodite bears arms. Several may be connected with the subject of travel; e. g. those on the Argonautic expedition. Fragment 11

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Eur. Med. 1021-1080.

<sup>2</sup> L. c., p. 303.

<sup>3</sup> L. c., pp. 288 f.

<sup>4</sup> L. c., pp. 298, 302 f.

<sup>5</sup> L. c., p. 290.

<sup>6</sup> The numbers are those of Hartung, *Die griechischen Elegiker*, Leipzig, 1859. Several of these fragments refer to the Argonauts, and are cited by the scholiast on Apollonius.

deals with magic; number 4 mentions a beautiful goblet, and is suggestive of carousing. Not a trace of subjective erotic elegy appears in the fragments. But the subjective element may well have been in the introduction, from which nothing seems to have survived. Furthermore, the fact that both Callimachus and Catullus<sup>1</sup> put a ban upon Antimachus shows that he was not well thought of, and might of itself have operated to deter Propertius from paying much attention to him. The only reference<sup>2</sup> to Antimachus in the whole of Propertius couples him with Homer, and this is an unfavorable indication. On the other hand, every reference to Philetas, and there are five,<sup>3</sup> points to a direct and close connection between him and Propertius. The five references<sup>4</sup> to Callimachus also indicate an intimate relationship. One may therefore accept Wilamowitz's conclusions about Antimachus, but hardly about Callimachus, nor about Philetas, as will presently be more fully shown. Nothing need here be said about his brief discussion<sup>5</sup> of less important writers, such as Euphorion and Parthenius and the older Roman poets.<sup>6</sup> Slight acquaintance with the literary remains of Hermesianax is enough to convince anyone that the author of the Cynthia book owed no debt to him. There is no reference to him anywhere in Propertius.

In reading Tibullus and Propertius, one is struck with the many themes that are common to both. Of course there is much difference between them; Tibullus sings the praises of rustic life; Rome is good enough for Propertius. The latter has but one concern—his passion for Cynthia; the former certainly has other interests beside Delia. Yet the points of agreement in their writings are very numerous. Tibull. 1. 3 is a *prophet-*

<sup>1</sup> Callim. fr. 74 b, Schneider:

Λύδη καὶ παχὺν γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν.

Catull. 95. 10:

At populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho.

<sup>2</sup> Prop. 2. 34. 45.

<sup>3</sup> Prop. 2. 34. 31; 3. 1. 1; 3. 3. 52; 3. 9. 44; 4. 6. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Prop. 2. 1. 40; 2. 34. 42; 3. 1. 1; 3. 9. 43; 4. 1. 64.

<sup>5</sup> L. c., pp. 291 ff.

<sup>6</sup> The importance of Catullus in Elegy is shown by Professor A. L. Wheeler in A. J. P. 36 (1915), pp. 155 ff.

*ptikon*; so is Prop. 1. 8.<sup>1</sup> Prop. 1. 6 may be compared with Tibull. 1. 1. Prop. 1. 16 is a *paraklausithyron*, like Tibull. 1. 2; a comparison shows that they are alike in many details. Minor themes which they have in common may be added in large numbers.<sup>2</sup> They are so numerous that they could not have been due to chance. As Wilamowitz says<sup>3</sup> in another connection, the poets could not "sich das aus den Fingern gesogen haben". They were not members of the same literary circle, and their books appeared at nearly the same time; so imitation is almost out of the question. The expressions and sentiments, then, must have been commonplaces in the field of elegy. There must therefore have been a well-developed subjective erotic elegy before the Augustan age, and it is probable that it was Alexandrian. Philetas is the poet to whom the signs point. Pohlenz has made out a strong case for him.<sup>4</sup> We may note here matters in which the fragments of Philetas show a relation with Tibullus and Propertius.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Professor Kirby Smith's note on Tibull. 1. 3. Most of the parallels cited are from my own collections; a few are from Smith or Harrington, or from dissertations in the field.

<sup>2</sup> Some of them are: the *custos*, Prop. 1. 11. 15; Tibull. 1. 2. 15; 1. 3. 84; and elsewhere. Dislike for war and all things military, Prop. 1. 6. 29; Tibull. 1. 1. 75. The power of magic, Prop. 1. 1. 23; Tibull. 1. 2. 43 f.; 1. 8. 19. The poet and his lady are tender, and not used to hardship, Prop. 1. 8. 7; Tibull. 1. 1. 46; 1. 2. 73; and elsewhere. No happiness without love, Prop. 1. 14. 22; Tibull. 1. 2. 75. Nights of wakefulness and tears, Prop. 1. 1. 33; 1. 11. 5; Tibull. 1. 2. 76. The lover's hard lot, and the cruelty of girls (boys, too), Prop. 1. 12; 1. 15; 1. 18; Tibull. 1. 6. 5 ff.; 1. 9; and elsewhere. The poet's forgiving spirit, Prop. 1. 8. 17 f.; 1. 18. 14 f.; Tibull. 1. 6. 56; 1. 9. 40. No cure nor end of love, Prop. 1. 5. 28; 1. 8. 21; 1. 12. 20; 1. 19. 6; Tibull. 1. 4. 81 f.; 1. 5. 37 ff. The poet's tender heart, Prop. 1. 6. 11; 1. 18. 13 ff.; Tibull. 1. 1. 51 f. Happiness of life with her, Prop. 1. 14. 9 ff.; Tibull. 1. 1. 57 f.; 1. 5. 21 ff. The vanity of riches, Prop. 1. 14. 23 f.; Tibull. 1. 1. 77 f. Life wretched without her, Prop. 1. 17. 1 ff.; Tibull. 1. 5. 1 ff. The lover's weakness and pallor, Prop. 1. 5. 21 f.; Tibull. 1. 8. 52. Youth the time for love, Prop. 1. 19. 25 f.; Tibull. 1. 1. 69. How she should act in his absence, Prop. 1. 15. 9 ff.; Tibull. 1. 3. 83 ff. Her perjury, Prop. 1. 15. 25; Tibull. 1. 6. 7 f.; 1. 9. 3. The poet as *praeceptor amoris*, Prop. 1. 10. 21 ff.; Tibull. 1. 6. 9 ff.; 1. 8. 55 ff.

<sup>3</sup> L. c., p. 287.

<sup>4</sup> L. c., pp. 108-112.

<sup>5</sup> We are at a great disadvantage here, for it is the Bittis which is supposed to have been the best example of subjective elegy, and we

The fragments of Philetas show the sorrows of life (1, 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 14);<sup>1</sup> examples from Propertius and Tibullus have been given above, in connection with Mimnermus. These woes are endless, and there is no relief (fr. 3, 7): cf. Prop. 1. 6. 25, 35 f. The idea that death ends all (fr. 6) is close to the thought of Prop. 1. 19. 25 f. and Tibull. 1. 1. 69 f. The worth of poetry in love appears in fr. 10;<sup>2</sup> cf. Prop. 1. 8. 39 f.; Tibull. 1. 4. 61 ff. The desire to be remembered after death, another prominent elegiac motif, is in fr. 11: see Prop. 1. 7. 9 f. The scene in 13 recalls Prop. 1. 17. The motif of spinning is seen in 18; cf. Prop. 1. 3. 41; Tibull. 1. 3. 86 f. Number 19 praises modesty: Prop. 1. 16. 2 is a faint parallel, while similar expressions are found in 1. 2. Fr. 21 reveals the love of country life so familiar in Tibullus; cf. 1. 1 *et passim*. Propertius seeks the country only when he wants a lonely place where he may rail at fate and Cynthia (1. 18). Probably fragments 20, 22, and 24 are echoes of the same feeling. In 27 we meet with the marriage of Jason and Medea. Medea's name in the Roman pair is coupled with the idea of witchcraft; Prop. 1. 1. 24; Tibull. 1. 2. 51. Her marriage does not appear there: Propertius has an allusion to the Argonauts in 1. 20. 17 ff. We find no example of a myth treated in the manner of Propertius; no fragment is long enough for that. Mythological references occur, however, in 15, 16, and 27: the last may have been of some length. Of course the Demeter and the Hermes were long poems on mythological subjects, but these were not subjective elegy. Fr. 5 is a story of Odysseus and Polymela, daughter of Aeolus, selected by Parthenius for his friend Gallus among the tales to be used in poetry of this sort. This would do as well

---

have not a single fragment which we know to have come from it. On the other hand, most of our fragments of Mimnermus are cited expressly from the Nanno.

<sup>1</sup>Hartung's numbering. As the first three of these are from the Demeter, and probably refer to her troubles, perhaps they should not be cited as parallels to mortal woes.

<sup>2</sup>So Hartung, and Reitzenstein, *Epigramm u. Skolion*, p. 179. But Bach, Maass, and Cessi have interpreted these obscure words differently; see Cessi, *de Philitae carminibus quaestiones*, in *Eranos* 8 (1908), pp. 141 ff., and his references.

as the Aitia of Callimachus in furnishing material for Propertius.<sup>1</sup>

This is not an imposing list of parallels between Philetas and the Romans, but as nearly all (eight out of nine) are found in Propertius and five in Tibullus, the proportion is better than for Mimnermus. Moreover, the small number of lines surviving from Philetas must be considered—47 as compared with 83 full lines of Mimnermus. Altogether, they may serve to advance somewhat the claims made for Philetas.

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

<sup>1</sup> Wilamowitz admits this; p. 290.